Comment to FCC Study 1:

A Comparison of Media Outlets and Owners For Ten Selected Markets (1960, 1980, 2000) By Scott Roberts, Jane Frenette and Dione Stearns

Author of Comment:
Dr. Clemencia Rodriguez
Associate Professor
Department of Communication
University of Oklahoma
clemencia@ou.edu

Please view in layout format

1. On the second paragraph of the executive summary this study highlights, as a main conclusion, that "[c]ollectively, the number of media outlets and owners increased tremendously over the 40-year period from 1960 to 2000." Later on, the study also concludes that the number of media owners from 1980 to 2000 has been "stagnant." I believe that, if the purpose of these FCC studies is to assess the effects of de-regulation and consolidation, the data comparing 1980 to 2000 is much more significant than the data comparing 1960 to 2000. Table 1 of the study **only** compares the number of media outlets and media owners in 1960 with 2000; why didn't the researchers include the comparison between 1980 and 2000? Consolidation and deregulation happened mainly during the 1980s and especially during the 1990s (the Telecommunication Act passed in 1996), so the data that matters are pre and post deregulation.

Why did the researchers chose 1980 and 2000 as comparison points? It would have been much more significant to chose 1995 (before the Telecomm Act) and 2000 (five years after the Telecomm Act). 1980 does not have any significance—that I know of—in the history of deregulation.

The following Table A shows the percentage of increase of media owners from 1960 to 1980 and from 1980 to 2000. Clearly, all ten percentages for 1980-2000 (after the Telecomm Act) are much smaller than the percentages for 1960-1980 (before the Telecomm Act). I have calculated the percentage increase for 1980-2000, which the study did not.

Table A. Percentage increase of media owners in ten markets.

Market	% increase media owners 1960 - 1980	% increase media owners 1980 - 2000	% increase media owners 1960 - 2000
New York City	93%	-2%	90%
Burlington	115	21	162

Kansas	106	0	106
Myrtle Beach	167	44	283
Birmingham	70	12	90
Terre Haute	138	16	175
Little Rock	114	10	136
Charlottesville	100	40	180
Lancaster	60	25	100
Altoona	33	25	67

Table B (below) is a revised version of the study's Table 1. What I have done here is to include the comparison between number of media outlets and media owners from 1980 to 2000. Clearly, the increase in number of media outlets is significantly smaller after 1980 in all ten markets. More important, the number of media owners decreased a great deal since 1980 in all ten markets.

Table B. Summary of media outlets and owner count for 10 selected markets (1960, 1980, 2000).

Na	ew York NY		Rurlington	VT/Plattshur	nh NY	
Market Rank #1				Burlington VT/Plattsburgh NY Market Rank #141		
IVIC	Thet Name #1		IVIAI	Net Nailk #141		
	Media Outlets	Owners		Media Outlets	Owne	
1960	89	60	1960	15	13	
1980	154	116	1980	37	28	
2000	184	114	2000	53	34	
% Change '60-'00	107%	90%	% Change '60-'00	253%	162%	
% Change 60-80	76%	93%	% Change 60-80	147%	115%	
% Change 80-00	19%	-2%	% change 80-00	43%	21%	
,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1070		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	1070	2170	
Kar	sas City MO		Myr	tle Beach SC		
	rket Rank #29			ket Rank #169		
IVIQ	IKCT KAIIK #25		IVIGI	Not Namk #105		
	Media Outlets	Owners		Media Outlets	Owne	
1960	22	16	1960	6	6	
1980	44	33	1980	22	16	
2000	53	33	2000	38	23	
% Change '60-'00	141%	106%	% Change '60-'00	533%	283%	
% Change 60-80	100%	106%	% Change 60-80	267%	167%	
%Change 80-00	20%	0%	% Change 80-00	72%	44%	
700/idings oo oo	2070	0 70	70 Ghange de de	7270	4470	
Rir	mingham Al		Tai	rre Haute IN		
	rket Rank #57			ket Rank #197		
IVIA	TREL RAIIK #51		IVIAI	Ket Kalik #191		
	Media Outlets	Owners		Media Outlets	Owne	
1960	28	20	1960	12	8	
1980	44	34	1980	26	19	
2000	59	38	2000	33	22	
% Change '60-'00	111%	90%	% Change '60-'00	175%	175%	
% Change 60-80	57%	70%	% Change 60-80	117%	138%	
% Change 80-00	34%	12%	% Change 80-00	27%	16%	
/o change ee ee	3 470	1270	,, cg	2170	1070	
l it	tle Rock AR		Char	lottesville VA		
	Market Rank #85			ket Rank #225		
IVIQ	Ret Rank #00		IVIGI	NOT NATIK #220		
	Media Outlets	Owners		Media Outlets	Owne	
1960	17	14	1960	8	5	
1980	35	30	1980	13	10	
2000	60	33	2000	23	14	
% Change '60-'00	253%	136%	% Change '60-'00	188%	180%	
% Change 60-80	106%	114%	% Change 60-80	63%	100%	
% Change80-00	71%	10%	%Change 80-00	77%	40%	
J		10,0	The state of the s			
l a	ncaster PA		Δ	Itoona PA		
	ket Rank #113			Market Rank #253		
IVIAI	Not Rails #110		IVIAI	NOT INDIES #200		
	Media Outlets	Owners		Media Outlets	Owne	
1960	14	10	1960	11	Owne 9	
1980	21	16	1980	19	12	
2000	25	20	2000	23	15	
% Change '60-'00	79%	100%	% Change '60-'00	109%	67%	
% Change 60-80	50%	60%	% Change 60-00 % Change 60-80	73%	33%	
70 Change 00-00	JU /0	00 /0	/o Change 60-60	13/0	33%	

% Change 80-00

19%

25%

% Change 80-00

21%

25%

- 2. An interesting piece of data from Table 2 in the study (not shown here) is that two of the ten markets lost their daily owners. In 1980 (before the Telecomm Act), Altoona PA and Myrtle Beach SC had their own locally owned dailies. By 2000 both these markets had lost their locally owned newspapers.
- 3. I believe the study does not put enough emphasis on the consolidation of commercial radio in all ten markets. Table C (below) compares the number of commercial radio owners in 1980 and 2000 in all ten markets (data extracted from the study's Table 3).

Table C. Number of commercial radio owners in 1980 and 2000

Market	Number of commercial radio owners in 1980	Number of commercial radio owners in 2000	% Increase
New York City	67	41	-38%
Burlington VT/Plattsburgh NY	14	14	0%
Kansas City MO	22	16	-27%
Myrtle Beach SC	11	13	18%
Birmingham AL	24	18	-25%
Terre Haute IN	12	10	-17%
Little Rock AR	20	16	-20%
Charlottesville VA	6	4	-33%
Lancaster PA	5	6	20%
Altoona PA	7	7	0%

According to these numbers, only two of the ten markets—Myrtle Beach and Lancaster—experienced an increase in the number of commercial radio owners. Two markets—Burlington/Plattsburgh and Altoona—did not experience any increase. And six markets experienced a decrease in the number of commercial radio owners (New York City, Kansas City, Birmingham, Terre Haute, Little Rock, and Charlottesville). In conclusion, 60% of the study's sample experienced consolidation of commercial radio.